

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA**

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**2007 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT**

**Threshold Review Period 7/1/05 to 6/30/06**

**Commission Members**

Kevin O'Neill, Chairman (Development)  
Joanne Clayton Vice Chair (Planning Commission Representative)  
David W. Krogh (Sweetwater/Bonita)  
Arthur M. Garcia (Education)  
Steve Palma (Southwest)  
Russ Hall (Center City)  
Theresa Acerro (Environmental)  
Tim P. Jones (Business)  
Joe Little (Eastern Territories) – (to 03-23-07)  
Matthew Waters (Development) – (to 12-08-06)

**Staff**

Mark Stephens, Growth Management Coordinator (to 10-13-06)  
Frank J. Herrera-A, Growth Management Coordinator  
Rabbia Phillip, Secretary

City of Chula Vista  
Planning and Building Department  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  
(619) 691-5101  
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

**August 2007**

**Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 06-12) and  
City Council (Resolution No. 2007-198) on August 2, 2007**

# GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: June 21, 2007

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Kevin O'Neil, Chairman  
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2007 GMOC Annual Report (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006, to the Current Time and Five-Year Forecast)

---

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the various City departments' staff as well as the school districts, water districts, and Air Pollution Control District in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Rabbia Phillip, Frank J. Herrera-A, Stan Donn and Ed Batchelder, as well as former Growth Management Coordinator Mark Stephens, who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice Chair Joanne Clayton-Eason, Art M. Garcia, Steve Palma, David Krogh, Theresa Acerro, Tim P. Jones, Russ Hall, and Joe Little. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

Over the last few years the GMOC has been in the lead identifying ways we can become more responsive to the community and effective in our message to Council. The most important aspects of those changes have been:

- Holding (regular) public workshops;
- Focusing greater attention on western Chula Vista; and,
- Having greater future vision, by dealing with current issues and looking critically at the next five-year time period.

In December, 2005 the new Growth Management Element of the General Plan was adopted and drafts of the updated Growth Management Ordinance and Program Guidelines Document are being completed and moved forward for City Council adoption sometime in 2007, and will be available for review by the GMOC in its next cycle.

Chula Vista has been one of the fastest growing cities in the region and the state, and the City has done a remarkable job in providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate this development. This is a testament to the current growth management program, and all the individual actions that have taken place. We sometimes hear the complaints about growth, but I know of no other jurisdiction that has handled this level of growth so well, and maintained a desirable city image. At the same time, the GMOC is dedicated to continuing to improve the City.

Nine of the eleven quality of life thresholds were determined by the GMOC to be in compliance, these are:

## GMOC Chair Cover Memo

August 2, 2007

- Fiscal
- Air Quality
- Sewer
- Water
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Fire/EMS - Strong improvement is noted for fire this year.
- Traffic
- Schools

The two thresholds that were not in compliance are:

- Libraries - the Rancho Del Rey proposed library is moving forward, but has not been funded as of this date.
- Police, priority II

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of the eleven threshold standards, identified issues, findings, and recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council.

The GMOC held its first workshop retreat at the nature Interpretive Center for the purpose of informally discussing existing GMOC thresholds and proposed, potential future thresholds. The GMOC is of the opinion that a comprehensive review of existing thresholds should be conducted, and that additional thresholds should be considered. The overall discussion is located in part four of this report (see page 36).

City Council referrals from the 2006 review cycle were also considered and evaluated as part of this year's review. The GMOC concluded that the following thresholds should be revisited during the GMOC's next cycle for further review and discussion: Police, Traffic and perhaps include a mechanism to address a future Transportation Element. The GMOC's recommendations are further described in part four of this report (see page 38).

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
2007 DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b>GMOC Chair Cover Memo .....</b>	<b>i – ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>1 - 3</b>
<b>Report Preface – Quality of Life: A Broad Overview .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1 Threshold Standards .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3 GMOC 2007 Annual Review Process .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.4 Growth Forecast .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.5 Report Organization .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 FISCAL .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1.1 Maintenance of Development Impact Fee (DIF) .....	8
3.1.2 Independent Financial Review .....	9
3.1.3 Preventive Maintenance of Infrastructure City-Wide .....	9
<b>3.2 AIR QUALITY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.2.1 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement .....	10
<b>3.3 SEWER .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.3.1 Long Term Treatment Capacity .....	12
<b>3.4 WATER .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.4.1 Meeting Water Demands .....	14
3.4.2 Emergency Water Supply .....	15
3.4.3 Expanding Water Sources .....	16

<b>3.5</b>	<b>LIBRARIES .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.5.1	Library Building Plan .....	17
3.5.2	Library Hours of Operation and Access .....	18
3.5.3	Updating the Library Master Plan .....	18
<b>3.6</b>	<b>DRAINAGE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.6.1	Maintenance of Existing Drainage System .....	19
3.6.2	Increased Cost of NPDES Program .....	20
3.6.3	Complete Drainage Master Plan Work .....	21
3.6.4	Missing or Inadequate Drainage Improvements .....	21
<b>3.7</b>	<b>PARKS &amp; RECREATION .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.7.1	Threshold Compliance: Land/Facilities .....	23
3.7.2	Providing Parks and Recreation Facilities in Western Chula Vista.....	24
3.7.3	Parks and Recreation Master Plan .....	25
<b>3.8</b>	<b>POLICE .....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.8.1	Priority 1 Threshold .....	26
3.8.2	Priority 2 Threshold .....	27
3.8.3	Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes .....	27
3.8.4	Other Issues .....	28
<b>3.9</b>	<b>FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES .....</b>	<b>28</b>
3.9.1	Reporting Period Consistency .....	29
3.9.2	Fire Facilities Master Plan .....	29
3.9.3	Reporting Management Tool .....	30
<b>3.10</b>	<b>TRAFFIC .....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.10.1	Traffic Signal Adjustment .....	31
3.10.2	Maintenance & Rehabilitation of Streets .....	31
3.10.3	Format of Tables .....	32
<b>3.11</b>	<b>SCHOOLS .....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.11.1	GMOC School Progress .....	33
3.11.2	School District Accomplishments .....	33
3.11.3	City Assistance .....	35
<b>3.12</b>	<b>OTHER TOPICS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.12.1	New Challenges in Western Chula Vista .....	36
3.12.2	Comprehensive Listing of Facility Master Plans & Related Plans .....	36
3.12.3	Public comments .....	36
<b>4.0</b>	<b>POTENTIAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROG. CHANGES....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>GMOC RETREAT &amp; INFORMAL DISCUSSION SESSION .....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1.1	Water / Drainage .....	37

4.1.2	Police Department Specifics .....	37
4.1.3	Libraries .....	38
4.1.4	Parks and Recreation .....	38
4.1.5	Traffic .....	38
4.1.6	Possible New Thresholds .....	38
<b>4.2</b>	<b>2006 PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementation Actions</b>	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Appendix B – Workshop Report (see Volume II)</b>	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Appendix C – Growth Forecast (see Volume II)</b>	
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Appendix D – Threshold Questionnaires &amp; Supplemental Data (see Vol. II)</b>	

---

## **Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview**

---

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life, and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the city has the ability to act and can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body, such as the GMOC, to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that it has a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be a part of the formal GMOC purview, but nonetheless maintenance and upkeep of necessary infrastructure for the city is important to all. This potentially impacts the quality of life for the current and future residents of the City in such instances that the increased costs of deferred maintenance may consume a significant amount of budget resources, thereby requiring cuts that may impact services, such as parks and libraries. We find it important, for this issue to be raised so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, being mindful of the roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

The GMOC is pleased to say that overall the quality of life in the City of Chula Vista is being maintained and indeed, even improved. The master-planned communities of eastern Chula Vista are one of the most desirable and relatively affordable places to live in the county. The prospects for redevelopment in the west give rise to opportunities for physical improvements to be realized as they have in the east. Other exciting initiatives are progressing for the Chula Vista Bayfront and a new University Park and Research Center.

Some attributes of physical development in western Chula Vista will be addressed as the redevelopment process proceeds. Depending upon the rate of this growth, some of the pre-existing need issues may linger for what many feel is too long. Providing parks, curbs-gutters and sidewalks for the southwestern area of the city is being done, and this is recognized and appreciated. So when the GMOC indicates that more is also desired, it is done with recognition for the significant achievements we have seen in recent years.

The 2005 General Plan includes an updated Growth Management Element that provides a framework for continuing the evolution of the City's Growth Management Program. A revised Growth Management Ordinance and Growth Management Program Guidelines will also move forward for City Council adoption sometime in 2007.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 The Threshold Standards**

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. These include: Fiscal, Air Quality, Sewer, Water, Libraries, Drainage, Parks & Recreation, Police, Fire / Emergency Services, Traffic, and Schools. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs.

### **1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)**

To provide an independent, annual, City-wide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas, a member of the Planning Commission, and a cross section of interests including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three time frames:

1. A fiscal year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations which may have budget implications. This report focuses on Fiscal year July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.
2. Pertinent issues identified during the second half of 2006 and early 2007 are also addressed. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events.
3. A five-year forecast covering the period from January 2007 through December 2011 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

During this process, the GMOC distributes questionnaires to each City Department and outside agency that has responsibility for reporting on the eleven thresholds, and each completes the questionnaire to provide the GMOC a status of development impacts to the city. The GMOC reviews the completed questionnaires and deliberates issues of compliance, and the appropriateness of the threshold and whether they should be amended, or whether any new thresholds or standards should be considered.

## 1.3 GMOC 2007 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held 12 meetings from October 2006 through June 2007, which were open to the public. GMOC Members also participated in a city field trip on January 27, 2007. City Departments and external agencies completed threshold compliance questionnaires. The completed questionnaires were provided to the GMOC. The GMOC Commissioners reviewed the questionnaires and where necessary, asked department or agency representatives to appear in person to make clarifications and answer questions regarding the submitted questionnaires. Staff and GMOC identified issues and conditions as represented in the report. The GMOC also held a public workshop on May 31, 2007. See appendix D for this year's threshold questionnaires and responses.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council, tentatively scheduled for August 2, 2007.

## 1.4 Growth Forecast

The Planning and Building Department annually prepares a Five Year Growth Forecast, which was issued in early January 2007. The forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked whether their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth or not. The forecast from January 2007 through December 2011 indicated an additional 9,811 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city, (7,471 in the east and 2,340 units in the west) for an annual average of 1,494 in the east and 468 units in the west, or just over 1,962 housing units permitted per year on average citywide.

It should be noted that with rising interest rates and a general slowing of residential development on a regional basis over the past year, the number of residential units permitted in Chula Vista has declined from recent highs.

## 1.5 Report Organization

The 2007 GMOC Annual Report is organized into five sections:

**Section 1** is the introduction, describing the role of the GMOC, brief update on the process, and outline of the 2007 report.

**Section 2** provides summary tables of the threshold findings for the most recent review period.

**Section 3** provides a threshold by threshold presentation, including discussion, issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations.

**Section 4** is a summary of the GMOC'S workshop retreat evaluation of existing and potential future thresholds considerations, and also includes review of the Planning Commission and City Council referrals from the 2006 Annual Report.

**Section 5** Appendices.

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding thresholds for the 2007 annual review cycle. Nine thresholds were met and two were not.

2007 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/05 THROUGH 6/30/06				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Fiscal	X			
2. Air Quality	X			
3. Sewer	X			
4. Water	X			
5. Libraries		X	X	X
6. Drainage	X			
7. Parks & Recreation				
Land	X			
Facilities	X			
8. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	
9. Fire/EMS	X			
10. Traffic	X			
11. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X			
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			

## 3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

### 3.1 FISCAL

**Threshold:** The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5-year period.

The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING: In Compliance**

The threshold reflects the modification of the DIF Ordinance which allows for indexed automatic fee updates: for Traffic Signal Fee, Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF), Park and Acquisition Fee (PAD), Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF), Otay Ranch Village 11 Pedestrian Bridge and will also address Otay Ranch Villages 1,5, & 6 Pedestrian Bridge. DIF fees are adequate, being collected and spent.

---

#### **3.1.1 Maintenance of Development Impact Fees (DIF)**

**Issue:** No issue

**Discussion:** GMOC is aware of the ordinance of which regular impact fee updates are a part, that contains ample flexibility to allow the City to adjust the amount of revenue generated by development impact fees to keep pace with growth impacts on city facilities. Careful cash flow modeling of impact fees ensures that sufficient funds will exist to meet future needs despite unanticipated growth fluctuations. The GMOC appreciates the comprehensive information provided in this year's report.

**Recommendation:** None at this time.

#### **3.1.2 Independent Financial Review**

**Issue:** Outcome of the Independent Financial Review Report and relevance to GMOC.

**Discussion:** The GMOC is aware that a financial review entitled "Chula Vista Independent Financial Review" was conducted by the city during early 2007. That review was completed at a point too late in this year's review cycle for GMOC to receive, discuss and have any comment. The GMOC would be interested in the outcome of the report

where such may address financial conditions that could have an effect on service levels.

**Recommendation:** If the City Council feels that the Report's conclusions may have an implication on the ability to maintain service levels, then the GMOC feels it should discuss the report.

### 3.1.3 Preventive Maintenance of Infrastructure City Wide

**Issue:** Planning and funding for road way and infrastructure maintenance

**Discussion:** GMOC discussed how should the City address the issue of roadway and infrastructure deterioration and maintenance. The Commissioners were of the opinion that a Maintenance and Infrastructure Plan should be commissioned to address this issue and that funding should be identified and set aside for this purpose. Absent this escalating costs could become so significant that budget cuts in other areas could affect service levels and thresholds compliance.

**Recommendation:** All future budgets should provide adequate funds for preventive maintenance of infrastructure Citywide.

## 3.2 AIR QUALITY

**Threshold:** The GMOC Shall Be Provided With an Annual Report Which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of

those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

## **THRESHOLD FINDING:     *In Compliance***

As noted through the reports, the City continues to be a leader in implementing local measures and programs that contribute to pollution reduction and air quality improvement. As an additional note, although the State and Federal smog standards were exceeded for the San Diego region within the past 2 years, Chula Vista had “Zero” days over smog standards.

---

### **3.2.1     City Programs for Air Quality Improvement**

**Issue:**                               How to address air quality issues locally when air quality is affected by regional conditions.

**Discussion:**                       While it is recognized that air quality is affected on a regional basis, the City of Chula Vista is moving forward in several areas to lower energy consumption and emissions through the Action Measures in the Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) Reduction Plan adopted by Council in November 2000.

The GMOC supports the efforts undertaken by the City of Chula Vista to improve local and regional air quality. The City continues to implement several measures contained in the Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) Reduction Plan. Following is an explanation of the non-development related air quality programs identified as Action Measures in the CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Plan that have been updated during the reporting period:

#### Urban Heat Island Mitigation Project

The City completed a two-year project funded by the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection. Urban areas experience increased ambient air temperatures compared to surrounding undeveloped areas. Shade trees help reduce energy usage and improve air quality by removing CO<sub>2</sub>, dust and other particulates. 460 new trees were planted along older residential streets with the help of over 420 community volunteers.

#### Energy Conservation Program

In partnership with San Diego Gas & Electric, the City began a new three-year program to promote energy conservation throughout the community. By saving energy, the program helps improve local air quality by reducing the energy demand on power plants. The program also provides funding for the City to retrofit its facilities with newer energy-efficient technologies.

#### New Shade Tree Program

Beyond the above noted Urban Heat Island project, the City recently received a new grant from the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection to expand its shade tree planting program over the next few years. The new project will plant over 1,200 shade trees along residential streets, canyon parkways, and within community parks and will increase the air quality benefits associated with urban forests.

**Recommendations:**

- 1). The GMOC strongly urges that the City continue its effort in the reduction of Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>).
- 2). The GMOC also strongly urges that the City's fleet of vehicles be updated to use the latest –pollution reducing- technology now available. As City vehicles are retired they should be replaced with low- carbon, fuel-efficient models.

### **3.3 SEWER**

**Threshold:**

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12-18 month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
  - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
  - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
  - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - d. Other relevant information.

The Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:     *In Compliance***

Flows in the City sewer facilities are all currently within acceptable engineering standards. As shown in the following table, the City of Chula Vista's average flow in Million Gallons per Day (MGD) is within capacity allotted through the City contracts with the City of San Diego's Metro system (Point Loma facility) for the next five years.

SEWAGE Flow and Treatment Capacity							
	02/03 Fiscal Year	03/04 Fiscal Year	04/05 Fiscal Year	05/06 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Buildout"
Average Flow (MGD)	16.346	15.787	17.021	16.979	18.723	20.379	26.2*
Capacity	19.843	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**

\* Buildout Projection based on the current General Plan "Buildout".

\*\* Increase in capacity is based on the allocation of additional capacity rights resulting from the construction of the Southbay Treatment Plant (allocation process still underway)

### 3.3.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

**Issue:** The City of Chula Vista needs to acquire additional treatment capacity in the Metro System within the next 5 years

**Discussion:** Through the completion of the Wastewater Master Plan (2005), it was determined that to facilitate the City's build-out, we would need to acquire an additional 5MGD of treatment capacity rights. Additional capacity could be provided in either of two ways:

- 1). The construction of a treatment facility (i.e. a reclamation plant) or,
- 2). The purchase of the required capacity rights from another participating agency in the Metro system that has excess capacity rights.

Treatment Facility – The City is currently participating in a Joint Feasibility Study with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority to explore the feasibility of constructing a Wastewater Reclamation Plant that would take a portion of the raw sewage from the sewer system, treat it and generate recycled water that would then be utilized by Otay and Sweetwater in meeting their customers' irrigation needs. It is anticipated that this study will be completed in fall 2007.

Purchase of Additional Treatment Capacity Rights – The City is also exploring the feasibility of acquiring the additional capacity through the purchase of treatment capacity rights from other agencies in the Metro system who may have excess capacity in the system. Prior to this acquisition the City needs to do “a proposed” Capacity Valuation Study”.

To facilitate fair negotiations amongst participating agencies, the Metro Commission/JPA retained the services of a consultant to prepare a Capacity Valuation study, which would determine the fair value of treatment capacity rights within the Metro system.

It is anticipated that the study will be completed in the fall of 2007. The findings of that study will provide the framework for negotiations between member agencies.

**Recommendation:** That the “Proposed Capacity Valuation Study” be completed by fall 2007.

## 3.4 WATER

- Threshold:**
1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
  2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts’ replies should address the following:
    - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
    - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
    - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
    - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
    - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

### **THRESHOLD FINDING: *In Compliance***

Both the Otay Water District (OWD) and Sweetwater Authority have indicated that they will be able to meet Chula Vista’s water demand for the 12 – 18 month period, and for the next five years as reflected through the growth forecast as shown in the tables below.

---

## Otay Water District

<b>WATER SUPPLY CAPACITY (Million Gallons Per Day (MGD))</b>					
	<b>FY2003/04</b>	<b>FY2004/05</b>	<b>FY2005/06</b>	<b>12-18 Month Projection</b>	<b>5 Year Projection</b>
<b>Total Flow Supply Capacity</b>	130.6	130.6	138.7	144.6	201.5
<b>Potable Storage Capacity</b>	190.7	190.7	196.1	196.1	234.1
<b>Non-Potable Storage Capacity</b>	31.7	31.7	31.7	43.7	43.7
<b>Potable Supply Flow Capacity</b>	129.5	129.5	137.5	137.5	191.5
<b>Non-Potable Supply Flow Capacity</b>	1.1	1.1	1.2	7.1	10.0

## Sweetwater Authority

	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>12-18 Mo Projection</b>	<b>5 Year Projection</b>
<b>Yearly Demand - (Purchased by consumers, MG)</b>	8063	8081	7676	7934	8100	8350
<b>Yearly Supply Capacity, MG (1,2)</b>	26,740	27,740	27,740	27,240	27,740	27,740
<b>Storage Capacity, MG – Treated Water</b>	42	42	42	42	42	45
<b>Storage Capacity, MG - Raw Water</b>	17,421	17,421	17,421	17,421	17,421	17,421

Notes: (1) Maximum supply capacity includes 62 cfs(40 mgd) treated water connection, Robert Perdue Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desal. plant (4mgd) and National City Wells (2 mgd).

(2) Normal maximum supply capacity is from Robert Perdue Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desal. plant (4mgd) and National City Wells (2 mgd).

### 3.4.1 Meeting Water Demands

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** Both of the major water districts serving the City of Chula Vista, the Otay Water District and the Sweetwater Authority, report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Chula Vista has been a leader in water conservation and the recycled water distribution system has been expanded

in the master planned communities of eastern Chula Vista through efforts with the Otay Water District and the development community.

The GMOC supports these efforts as a way to limit potable water demands and maximize efficient use of available water supplies.

### **Otay Water District**

The Otay Water District (OWD) has anticipated growth, and effectively managed the addition of new facilities and water supply needs, and does not foresee any negative impacts to current or future service levels. In fact service levels have been enhanced with the addition of new major facilities that provide access to existing storage reservoirs and increase supply capacity from the Helix Water District Levy Water Treatment Plant, which came on line during FY 2003-2004 and the City of San Diego Otay Water Treatment Plant, which came on line during FY 2005-2006.

The OWD assures that facilities are in place to receive and deliver the water supply for all existing and future customers. Also, the OWD has an agreement with the City of Diego for recycled water supplies from their South Bay Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP). The City of San Diego formally approved the agreement on October 20, 2003. The agreement provides for a least 6 MGD of supply from the SBWRP. The supply link to receive the SBWRP recycled water supply is scheduled to be complete in the spring of 2007.

### **Sweetwater Authority**

Growth observed within the Sweetwater Authority service area during the review period (above table) was approximately 0.5%, which is not significant. Based on projected future growth current facilities can meet projected demands. However, new facilities will be required to accommodate the forecast growth for the 5–7 year time frame.

**Recommendation:** That the City continues to work with both water districts to maintain and track future development in order to continue to meet the water availability threshold.

## **3.4.2 Emergency Water Supply**

**Issue:** Provision of water supply during a catastrophic emergency.

**Discussion:** Both of the major water districts serving the City of Chula Vista, the Otay Water District and the Sweetwater Authority, report that they will be able to meet the water demands in case of a catastrophic emergency. State law requires that an emergency supply of up two years be available for its clients.

**Recommendation:** That GMOC continue to support the Water Districts and their water emergency Policy.

### 3.4.3 Expanding Water Sources

**Issue:** To find other sources of water and to optimize the use recycled water.

**Discussion:** The GMOC feels that the City should continue to work closely with the Water Districts to find alternative sources of water, in order to maximize the ability to meet future water demands, and to optimize the use of recycled water where feasible throughout the City, especially western Chula Vista. The GMOC would like to see other sources such as the possibility of desalination plants for future use as an alternative to imported and local water supply be explored.

**Recommendations:** The GMOC encourages Sweetwater Authority to address the feasibility of expanded recycled water use within their service area.

The GMOC supports the Sweetwater Authority effort for the provision of water through its desalination plant at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and SR 54 (Richard Reynolds Desalination Plant).

## 3.5 LIBRARIES

**Threshold:** The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

### **THRESHOLD FINDING:** *Not in Compliance*

City's library system has not kept pace with growth such that the facilities ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population has not been met for last three years, beginning with FY 03-04 as shown in the table below. As shown for future forecasts, the threshold will not come back into compliance until RDR is built.

---

### 3.5.1 Library Building Plan

	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
FY 1997-98	163,417	102,000	624
FY 1998-99	169,265	102,000	603
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544
FY 2001-02*	195,000	102,000	523
FY 2002-03*	203,000	102,000	502
<b>FY 2003-04*</b>	<b>211,800</b>	<b>102,000</b>	<b>482</b>
<b>FY 2004-05</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>102,000</b>	<b>464</b>
<b>FY 2005-06</b>	<b>223,423</b>	<b>102,000</b>	<b>457</b>
<b>12 Month Projection (12/31/06)*</b>	227,673	102,000	448
<b>5 year projection (thru 2011)</b>	263,300	133,129	506

\*Planning Division Estimate

\*\*5-year projections are based on GMOC Forecast. Assumes RDR library is built.

\*\*\*Previously assumed that EastLake Branch would close with the opening of Rancho del Rey Branch but because of the high circulation at this location it has been decided to keep it open until the Eastern Urban Center Branch opens late in the decade.

**Issue:** The gross square footage of 500 square feet per 1000 population has not been met. There is an urgency to begin construction of the Rancho Del Rey Library.

**Discussion:** With the community's continued population growth prior to completion of a new branch library at Rancho Del Rey, the ratio of gross square feet of library space first fell below the threshold standard at the end of June 2004, and has remained so up to the current GMOC cycle as shown in the table above. The Library Threshold Standard Implementation Measure requires that the City Council adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into conformance, and that construction or other actual solution shall be scheduled to commence within three years. Based on this, that would equate to June 2007.

Thus, the GMOC recognizes that construction of the Rancho Del Rey library needs to begin urgently.

The Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000 square foot full-service, regional library in Rancho del Rey. The GMOC understands that the City has a design/build agreement to complete a 31,200 square foot library at this site, that plans are complete and that the City has a contractual

commitment. Construction can begin once Council approves funding. Construction of the facility will take approximately one year.

As stated above, with completion of construction of the Rancho del Rey library the threshold would be back in compliance.

**Recommendation:** The GMOC recommends that Mayor and Council direct City Manager to secure funding and commence the RDR library construction. This would ensure that Libraries become compliant with the threshold standard within the Implementation Measure time frame, and possibly the next GMOC review cycle.

### **3.5.2 Library Hours of Operation and Access**

**Issue:** The need to define what “adequate hours of operation and access measures” in order to establish a basis for conducting annual GMOC assesment.

**Discussion:** The determination of “adequacy” for library hours of operation and access, and staffing are not clearly defined at this time. This makes it difficult for GMOC and Library to provide a fair and meaningful evaluation.

At the request of the GMOC, library staff provided a comparison of the hours of operation and access between Chula Vista and other neighboring jurisdictions. The research presented revealed that Chula Vista’s level of Library operation hours exceeded those of the nearby jurisdictions – for the two permanent facilities in western Chula Vista.

Given that this is fairly complex, the GMOC needs to work with GMOC staff and Library staff to define what is adequacy and how it should be applied to both hours of operation, access, and staffing for libraries. This should be analyzed and evaluated for the next GMOC cycle in order to provide a better response and to define yardsticks to use for future evaluations.

**Recommendations:** That the library staff be directed to continue to assess the optimum hours of operation in terms of serving the needs of service area patrons in the eastside of the City of Chula Vista and report to GMOC next year to establish a basis for defining adequacy.

### **3.5.3 Updating the Library Master Plan**

**Issue:** Library Master Plan needs to be updated to reflect December 2005 General Plan Update.

**Discussion:** The GMOC understands that the current threshold 60 k gross square feet (gsf) is based on the 1989 General Plan build-out population. With the recently adopted

General Plan Update in December 2005, significant housing and population capacity were added, which would affect the 500 square feet per 1000 threshold standard.

- Recommendation:** 1) Assess ultimate future library needs based upon the increased capacity from the City's updated General Plan, and accordingly update the Library Facilities Master Plan, and the threshold standards reference.
- 2) Actively pursue planning for a new Eastern Urban Center branch library.

## 3.6 DRAINAGE

**Threshold:** Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.

The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet that goal.

### **THRESHOLD FINDING:**     *Threshold Met*

Storm water flows and volumes during the reporting period were within City engineering standards.

---

### 3.6.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage System

**Issue:** Maintenance scheduling and repair of the city's drainage areas and working with the Environmental Resource Agencies and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the permitting of the scheduled maintenance.

**Discussion:** Today, maintenance of Chula Vista's drainage system serves two key functions (1) flood control to prevent loss of life and property damage and (2) water quality management. The City's Public Works Operations Department explained to the GMOC that much of the City's storm drainage system is considered environmentally sensitive habitat and requires permitting by the resource agencies in order to perform routine maintenance. These agencies have diverse and sometimes conflicting requirements. For example, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board is concerned with water quality, whereas Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the US Fish and Wildlife Service and State Fish and Game are more concerned with habitat and endangered species protection.

Because conflicting permitting regulations and requirements are problematic throughout the region, the Copermittees hired a consultant, EDAW, Inc., to meet with the resource agencies and develop a permit application process acceptable to all of them. EDAW was expected to submit the first draft of a permitting guidelines

document for the Copermittee's review, anticipated to be completed in February 2007. However, at the conclusion of this year's 2007 GMOC cycle, these guidelines have not been completed

A map entitled "Detention Basins and Natural Channel" was presented to the GMOC, which showed an initial list of eight critically impacted facilities that needed clearing to restore proper hydraulic capacities and flood control functions. These eight areas were identified, to be considered within the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) amongst the many other drainage channels needing maintenance. However, based on the conflicting permitting requirements mentioned above, it is difficult for City crews to conduct the necessary maintenance.

**Recommendation:** The City Council approve the budget to hire an appropriate firm to obtain necessary permits from the Resource Agencies for the proper maintenance of the City's drainage system.

### **3.6.2 Increased Cost of NPDES Program**

**Issue:** Increased costs for implementation of NPDES permits. The City's Storm Drain Fee is insufficient to provide funding for the City's drainage infrastructure needs and the requirements of the new NPDES permit.

**Discussion:** On January 24, 2007, the Regional Board adopted the new NPDES municipal permit for San Diego County as Order No. R9-2007-0001. The new permit imposes significant additional requirements on the copermittees, developers, and industrial/commercial businesses throughout the county. City staff estimates compliance with the new requirements will require additional funding for new staff, equipment, and programs in the amount of about \$5.7 million in General Fund revenues over the permit's five-year life. This is above and beyond the amount of General Funds now being used to cover some of the NPDES program costs; existing Storm Drain Fee revenues are not sufficient to cover the existing program costs let alone address the new permit requirements.

**Recommendation:** GMOC recommends that the Storm Drain Fees be reviewed and adjusted to meet the costs of the NPDES permit.

### **3.6.3 Completing Drainage Master Plan Work**

**Issue:** City's decision to use the Drainage Master Plan without waiting for the County of San Diego to implement its Hydrology Standards.

**Discussion:** The consultant, PBS&J, completed their work on the Drainage Facilities Master Plan. However, the City of Chula Vista was waiting on new Hydrology standards that are still under review by the County in order to proceed to implement the Drainage Facilities Master Plan. The County's Standards would result in changes to calculated flows. The County is revisiting the Standard at this time. Thus, it was decided to not utilize the County Standards until the County completed their revisions.

The City should proceed with the completed Drainage Facilities Master Plan, and not wait any longer on the County's Hydrology Standards. The City can come back and review the Hydrology Standards once the County has formally adopted them. It is understood that the flows calculated for the storm drainage basins may be affected and thus impact recommendations for facilities that need to be upgraded. This issue will be addressed by the Engineering Department in its course of the review for the new standards that may be adopted by the County.

**Recommendation:** GMOC recommends that the Engineering Department proceed to use the Drainage Master Plan as adopted.

### **3.6.4 Missing or Inadequate Drainage Improvements (Primarily in Southwest Chula Vista)**

**Issue:** How to acquire the necessary funding to upgrade and maintain the City's drainage system.

**Discussion:** The primary area of concern in western Chula Vista is the Montgomery Area, located within the southwestern area of Chula Vista, generally bound by L Street to the north and Hilltop Drive to the east. Scattered throughout the Montgomery area are areas with missing street and drainage improvements, such as missing curb-and-gutter and sidewalks. As a result of the incomplete improvements, both drainage and pavement-related problems occur. The drainage and street improvements should ideally be constructed prior to any pavement rehabilitation in order to preserve pavement life. In addition, due to inadequate drainage facilities and in some cases, drainage between/within residential properties, problems occur in these areas during the rainy season. Some of these areas can be improved through the Western Chula Vista Infrastructure Financing Program, but there are insufficient funds to provide all the identified deficient elements of the street and drainage systems.

The drainage deficiencies have been ranked in order of importance based on the estimated risk to health, safety, and property creating a comprehensive listing of potential improvements. The above information was presented to the City Council in a report along with a resolution entitled "Drainage Facilities Priority List", at an infrastructure workshop. The City Council approved this list by Resolution #2007-081 on April 7, 2007.

Maintenance of drainage facilities has been generally supported by the General Fund and to a lesser extent by Gas Tax and Storm Drain Fee funds. However, the cost of the City's NPDES program has expanded after the adoption of San Diego's municipal permit in February 2001 and the entire Storm Drain Fee is needed to fund this program. As a result of this action, the additional cost of administering the new

requirements of the January 2007 NPDES permit will require additional money from the General Fund.

Other funds can be used to finance capital projects, such as corrugated metal pipe (CMP) rehabilitation. As previously discussed, the Western Chula Vista Infrastructure Financing Program includes \$3.0 million to rehabilitate/ replace corroded CMP in western Chula Vista. City staff has also been investigating the feasibility of increasing the Storm Drain Fee to finance maintenance costs. The major projects have been related to CMP replacement and repair. The City also has a standard annual allocation of \$300,000 for this work.

Staff is also investigating other ways to raise funds for drainage projects, such as applying for grants and possibly enacting a property tax increase.

The above information was presented to the City Council in a report along with a resolution entitled “Drainage Facilities Priority List”, at an infrastructure workshop. The City Council approved this list by Resolution #2007-081 on April 7, 2007.

**Recommendation:** GMOC recommends that the City implement the drainage facilities per the Drainage Facilities Priority List as approved by Council at the infrastructure workshop meeting of April 4, 2007.” Resolution #2007-081.

### 3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

**Threshold:** Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING:** *Threshold Met*

**Land:** Actual: 3.58 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805

**Facilities:** The threshold standard requires that the requisite parkland (3 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805) be outfitted “with appropriate facilities”. During the reporting period the facilities sited within the requisite park acreage are consistent with the types of facilities identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan.

---

#### 3.7.1 Threshold Compliance

##### Land

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** Land threshold is in compliance for the reporting period. Current (6/30/06) eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory will provide adequate acreage to accommodate up to 125,670 persons. With a current east population of 105,373, there is a current developed parkland overage of 60.89 acres.

The 18-month forecast calls for an eastern Chula Vista population of 112,502 (an increase of 7,129). The increase would necessitate an additional 21.39 acres of developed parkland. With a current overage of 60.89 acres, current east inventories are adequate to accommodate the anticipated 18-month forecast.

Approximately 41.3 park acres (Mount San Miguel Community Park, Village 7 neighborhood park (All Seasons Park) and two Village 2 neighborhood parks) are to be constructed between December 2006 and December 2011 time frame. This translates to an eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory of 430.73 acres, which is capable of accommodating a total of 143,577 persons (greater than the forecast of 136,415 persons). Therefore, the 5-year forecast is anticipated to be accommodated.

**Recommendations:** None at this time

### **Facilities**

**Issue** None

**Discussion** During the reporting period the facilities sited within the requisite park acreage are consistent with the types of facilities identified in the City's Park and Recreation Master Plan and are therefore considered "appropriate" in the context of the threshold standard. The City's Park and Recreation Master Plan and the parkland dedication ordinance identify the formula for determining the quantity of facilities necessary to meet the recreational demand of the residents. However, the threshold standard does not identify a quantity of facilities necessary to be in compliance. However, based on those formulas certain types of facilities (e.g. practice softball fields, baseball fields, practice soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, and swimming pools) are currently experiencing shortages in terms of meeting current demands. From a practical sense some of the demand for these fields and courts are being met at non-public park sites such as school sites.

While future growth will result in the need and requirement for additional recreational facilities, there will continue to be demand placed on non-public recreation sites as well. The GMOC has expressed concern regarding the provision of needed recreational facilities at other types of sites beyond public parks. While fields and courts located at non-public recreation sites such as schools contribute to the overall inventory of facilities. Due to limited access by the general public, the GMOC does not consider school sites and the provision of the school site acreage as counting toward the GMOC threshold requirement.

**Recommendation** None at this time

### **3.7.2 Providing Park and Recreation Facilities in Western Chula Vista**

**Issue:** Provision of recreational facilities for western Chula Vista

**Discussion:** A challenge exists in western Chula Vista in terms of the delivery of and development of parkland and recreational facilities to meet the demands created by future residential development. Concern exists regarding the challenge of acquiring new parkland in developed areas of the City, particularly western Chula Vista.

While future growth will result in the need and requirement for additional parkland and recreational facilities, there will be increased challenges in securing appropriate park and recreation sites in western Chula Vista, where land is primarily built out. Lack of vacant and under-utilized parcels of land and/or competing demands and uses for land in the west represent obstacles to expanding park and recreation facility inventory. Developing creative strategies for delivering park and recreation facilities is essential to implementing the citywide standard for new park development.

The internal draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan document includes a focused discussion on park delivery in western Chula Vista. Strategies for future western Chula Vista parkland development include developing parks on public agency controlled lands, developing parks on underutilized and vacant lands suitable for parks, and developing parks of varying sizes and character (community, neighborhood, and urban parks) that demonstrably meet defined recreational needs. Future recreational needs in western Chula Vista can be addressed by individually and or collectively applying these strategies.

**Recommendations:** The GMOC requests that Parks and Recreation develop new models and approaches for meeting recreational land and facility needs, in developed western Chula Vista.

### **3.7.3 Parks and Recreation Master Plan**

**Issue:** Adoption of the Update Parks and Recreation Master Plan

**Discussion:** An internal draft of the update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan has been completed and is currently being reviewed by staff and city administration. The document maintains consistency with the established General Plan policy pertaining to providing 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons for new residential development citywide.

The GMOC has expressed an interest on receiving and reviewing updated studies and plans that address how future parkland and facility needs will be

addressed in western Chula Vista, including the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

**Recommendations:**

That a draft of the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan be made available for review by the GMOC as part of its report (2008 annual review cycle).

## 3.8 POLICE

**Threshold:**

**Priority I**

*Emergency Response*<sup>1</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

**Priority II**

*Urgent Response*<sup>2</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

***Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Met***

***Emergency response average time: Threshold Met***

***Urgent response within 7 minutes: Threshold Not Met***

***Urgent response average time: Threshold Not Met***

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	82.3%	7 minutes	4:51 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	40.0%	7 minutes	12:33 min./sec.

---

1 Priority 1 - Emergency Calls. Life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

2 Priority 2 - Urgent Calls. Misdemeanor in progress; possibility of severe injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglary alarms. Response: immediate response by one or two officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.).

### 3.8.1 Priority 1 Threshold Findings

PRIORITY I CFS – Emergency Response, Calls For Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>81.0%</b>	<b>5:30</b>
<b>FY 2005-06</b>	<b>1,068 of 73,075</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>4:51</b>
<b>FY 2004-05</b>	<b>1,289 of 74,106</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:11</b>
<b>FY 2003-04</b>	<b>1,322 of 71,000</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>4:52</b>
<b>FY 2002-03</b>	<b>1,424 of 71,268</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>4:55</b>
<b>FY 2001-02</b>	<b>1,539<sup>1</sup> of 71,859<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:07</b>
<b>FY 2000-01</b>	<b>1,734 of 73,977</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>5:13</b>

**Issue:** None at this time.

**Discussion:** As part of a trend of improved performance with respect to Priority 1 call responses in recent years, the Police Department is again back within compliance with the Priority 1 threshold for FY 2005-06 with 82.3% of calls responded to within 7.00 minutes.  
The average response time standard (5 minutes and 30 seconds) was also met; in fact the average response time was more than half a minute better than the GMOC standard.

**Recommendation:** None at this time

### 3.8.2 Priority 2 Threshold *Non-Compliance*

**Issue:** Continued Priority 2 call non-compliance

**Discussion:** The Priority 2 Threshold has not been met for several years, as illustrated in the table below. Although there was a decline in performance relative to this threshold during FY 2006, over the period of July 2006 --through December 2006, the Priority 2 response performance improved slightly (to 40.1% and 12 minutes, 5 seconds). Additional and substantial improvements have been seen during the first quarter of 2007 (to 45.8% and 10 minutes, 37 seconds). A Police Department analysis of Priority 2 calls indicates that the number of Priority 2 calls has increased 12% since FY 01-02; yet during this same period, the total number of citizen calls to the Department remained relatively unchanged. For several months during FY 05-06, the number of filled officer positions slightly exceeded the number of authorized positions; however, by the end of FY 05-06, the picture was reversed: By the end of FY 05-06 the picture was reversed as there were eight vacancies in the sworn ranks.

<sup>1</sup>These figures (as well as Priority II figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source. Using the old method of reporting calls for service to better compare change over time, total citizen-initiated calls actually increased 1.5% from FY00-01 to FY01-02.

	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>57.0%</b>	<b>7:30</b>
<b>FY 2005-06</b>	<b>24,876 of 73,075</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>12:33</b>
<b>FY 2004-05</b>	<b>24,923 of 74,106</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>11:40</b>
<b>FY 2003-04</b>	<b>24,741 of 71,000</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>9:50</b>
<b>FY 2002-03</b>	<b>22,871 of 71,268</b>	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>9:24</b>
<b>FY 2001-02</b>	<b>22,199 of 71,859</b>	<b>45.6%</b>	<b>10:04</b>
<b>FY 2000-01</b>	<b>25,234 of 73,977</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>9:38</b>

- Response times figures do not include responses to false alarms beginning in FY 2002-03.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to have the Police Department prepare and implement an action plan addressing the decline in performance relative to meeting the GMOC threshold for Priority 2 calls. The GMOC recommends that this be done by 2008 so that progress in developing and implementing the plan can be reflected in the Police Department's next report to the GMOC.

### 3.8.3 Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes

**Issue:** City Council has asked that Priority 1 response times that are 10 minutes or longer be sent to the GMOC for Council review.

**Discussion:** During the current reporting period, 5.9% of Priority 1 calls (50 of the 850 calls available for analysis) had response times greater than 10 minutes. The most frequent type of Priority 1 calls with response times over 10 minutes were robbery/duress alarms, all of which were false. Other common Priority 1 calls with response times over 10 minutes included attempted suicide and overdose calls. The most typical reason for Priority 1 response times over 10 minutes was that there were limited or no units available to respond.

**Recommendation:** That the Police Department include with its GMOC Annual Report a review of the priority 1 calls that took longer than 10 minutes and whether there were any negative results due to the longer response times.

That the Police Department closely monitor performance with regard to Priority 1 calls with response times over 10 minutes.

### 3.8.4 Other Issues

**Discussion:** While the GMOC agrees that there is more to the quality of police service than response times, response time is an established community norm that is expected to be met.

The Police Department has requested GMOC support for various upgrades/improvements. While the GMOC is not opposed to any of these, it would be beneficial to understand how implementation of any of these initiatives will specifically improve Priority 2 response times.

One other item that needs to be taken into consideration is the differences between topography in the west side and that of the east side. The east side tends to have more canyons and topographical challenges than the west side. These are the types of issues that need to be addressed when staff reviews the threshold for police.

**Recommendation:** GMOC recommends that these issues be reviewed at the next GMOC cycle.

### 3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

**Threshold:** Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

**THRESHOLD FINDING:** *Threshold Met*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
<b>Actual</b>		
Emergency Response	85.2	7 minutes

#### 3.9.1 Reporting Period Consistency

<b>FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times Since 1994</b>		
Years	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%
CY 2005	9,907	81.6%
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%
CY 1999	6,344	77.2%
CY 1998	4,119	81.9%
CY 1997	6,275	82.4%
CY 1996	6,103	79.4%
CY 1995	5,885	80.0%
CY 1994	5,701	81.7%

Also, the Fire/EMS response time threshold was met for calendar year 2006. (Data were presented for the calendar year, as had been the case prior to 2000, rather than a fiscal year period as used the last several annual reports.)

<b>Issue:</b>	None
<b>Discussion:</b>	The Fire response time threshold was met during calendar year 2006 for the second year in a row even with a substantial increase in the number of reported emergency calls. Dispatch time improved significantly with full operation of its dispatch center. The GMOC commends the Fire Department for this improvement.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That fire department should return to the fiscal year basis used for all other thresholds standards. We recommend that the Chief and City Manager return to that basis for the next review cycle.

### **3.9.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan**

<b>Issue:</b>	Complete review of the Fire Facilities Master Plan and consistency in reporting system.
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>The Fire Department has informed the GMOC that the Fire Facility Master Plan update is under review by City Manager's office and that the Advance Life Support (ALS) for delivery services for paramedics is to be completed in the Fall (2007).</p> <p>The GMOC is of the opinion that a consistent reporting period be used in the future for reporting annual response time data. The enhanced tracking and reporting capabilities of the City's system should facilitate this effort.</p>
<b>Recommendations:</b>	That the City Council direct the City Manager to oversee the completion of the Fire Facilities Master Plan update and Advance Life Support (ALS) as soon as feasible.

### **3.9.3 Reporting Management Tool**

<b>Issue:</b>	Dispatch, turnout, and travel time components of the Fire Department/EMS of the city needs to establish a daily monitoring tool for trip response by each station.
<b>Discussion:</b>	For several years, the GMOC has recommended that the Fire Department establish a daily reporting function of trip response time by each station by trip as a management tool. During this year's review, the Fire Department provided an example of a monthly reporting format generally along these

lines. The Fire Chief reported to the GMOC that this has become a useful management tool and performance incentive. The GMOC is pleased to see that this capability has been re-established for the City dispatching system.

**Recommendations:**

That the City Council direct the City Manager to:

- 1) Continue the recently re-established emergency response reporting function that furnishes information by station and identifies the dispatch, turnout, and travel time components; and,
- 2) Ensure an internal review process is in place to address issues identified and take corrective actions in a timely manner when needed to meet the threshold.

## 3.10 TRAFFIC

**Threshold:**

*City-wide:* Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

*West of I-805:* Those signalized arterial segments that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:     *Threshold Met***

All City-wide signalized arterial segments are operating at level of service in compliance with threshold standards listed above, except north-bound on Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road.

---

### 3.10.1 Traffic Signal Adjustment

**Issue:**

An LOS E resulted on a segment of Heritage Road, between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road.

**Discussion:**

For Traffic, the Heritage Road segment between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway has a free flow speed reflecting a high level of service (LOS). However, a temporary LOS E on this segment has resulted during the PM and D during the AM and mid-day peak period. This problem of LOS E was attributed to signal timing favoring Telegraph Canyon Road combined with the shorter than typical segment length, and not to growth or traffic. The signal timing issue has not been resolved.

Once Heritage Road is extended south from Olympic Parkway to Main Street, it is expected that the segment performance will improve. Traffic patterns are expected to shift which result in fewer trips and less signal time.

From the perspective of the GMOC, Traffic Engineering staff is left with the following options:

- a. Re-time the traffic signal to reduce the delay on northbound Heritage Road.
- b. Re-analyze the two roadways upon the opening of SR-125.
- c. Make no further modifications at this time, but continue to monitor the situation

At this time, with the opening of SR-125 proposed for late 2007, all forecasted growth can be accommodated.

**Recommendation:** GMOC supports Option C in the short-term and further recommends that the situation be re-evaluated after the opening of SR-125.

### **3.10.2 Maintenance and Rehabilitation of City Streets**

**Issue:** Street pavement and maintenance.

**Discussion:** The standard sources of funding for pavement rehabilitation include the Gasoline Excise Tax, which is used by the City's crews to perform pavement spot repairs. Funding sources for major pavement rehabilitation include Transnet (\$5.5 to \$6.0 million per year) and Proposition 42 (Gasoline Sales Tax) funds. The City also anticipates receiving approximately \$7.0 million from State Proposition 1B, which was adopted in November 2006, but it isn't clear when these funds will be distributed.

However, the determination on whether these funds will be sufficient depends on the City's goal in pavement management. The above funding sources would allow for a \$6.0 million annual pavement rehabilitation program. This level of funding will result in an overall deterioration of the City's pavement over the long term and a backlog of streets that need overlays or reconstruction. Staff conducted a Council presentation this spring, which presented various pavement rehabilitation scenarios and the amount of funding required for each, along with additional funding options.

**Recommendation:** GMOC recommends that a Pavement Management Plan inclusive of maintenance schedules be adopted and implemented for all City streets.

### **3.10.3 Format of Tables**

**Issue:** Readability of tables illustrating road segment for threshold compliance.

**Discussion:**

The GMOC requested that a more “reader friendly” format be devised for the tables illustrating road segment threshold compliance. In response, the Engineering Department devised a series of colored maps to show the Level of Service (LOS) on identified segments at a.m., mid-day and p.m. peak traffic periods. The GMOC finds the maps prepared for this year’s review to be a useful tool in making the findings easier to understand, commends the Engineering Department for this effort, and recommends that this be used in future TMP reviews. The GMOC finds the maps prepared for this year’s review to be a useful tool in making the findings easier to understand, commends the Engineering Department for this effort, and recommends that this be used in future TMP reviews.

**Recommendation:**

That the Engineering traffic table segments map, as revised, be used for the review of future TMP.

### 3.11 SCHOOLS

**Threshold:**

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local school districts Chula Vista Elementary School District and Sweetwater Union School District, with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts’ replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**- *Threshold Met***

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
***Threshold Met***

The Chula Vista Elementary School and the Sweetwater Union High School Districts have indicated that facilities are adequate to meet 12 –18 month and the 5 year capacities.

---

### **3.11.1 GMOC School Progress**

**Issue:** None for this cycle.

**Comment:** Over the years the GMOC has not been hesitant to raise issues and concerns regarding schools. This year represents continued progress in moving forward in a pragmatic and comprehensive manner. The GMOC supports the proactive efforts of the Sweetwater Union High School District to extend the modernization program beyond completion of Proposition BB improvements by passing Proposition O in 2006. This \$644 million bond program will allow the district to continue to aggressively improve facilities district-wide. For the Sweetwater District, additional schools are planned in Otay Ranch Village Eleven and Eight.

**Recommendation:** None.

### **3.11.2 School District Accomplishments**

**Comment:** The GMOC is impressed with the level of accomplishments that both school districts have achieved. The financing and construction of new elementary, middle and high schools are a testament to the functioning of well operated systems.

#### **Sweetwater Union High School District**

- The Sweetwater Union High School District has continued to make major progress in 2006, Olympian High School was opened.
- In addition, plans for a combined middle school/high school is designed and ready for submittal to the Division of State Architect. A unique design provides two schools on one campus, the 7/8 grade students have separate classroom and PE from 9/12 grades but the site shares administration, library and food services facilities. The three-story design is compatible for its location in EUC Village Eleven and is targeted for construction in the next two years as the demands of growth necessitate.
- Implementation of the Sweetwater District's Long Range Facilities Master Plan is bringing older schools up to standard and accommodating continuing growth. the Proposition BB modernization program is to be completed in 2007, 11 years ahead of schedule. Following numerous "summer sprint" projects at eight campuses across the district the will have leveraged the \$187 million from Proposition BB into \$327 million effort utilizing State funding. Work efforts associated with Proposition O have commenced and construction could begin as early as 2008.

- The district continues to be a good community partner in the City hosting dozens of youth leagues and other joint use projects.

### **Chula Vista School Elementary District**

The GMOC also supports the ongoing efforts of the Chula Vista Elementary School District to provide additional schools planned in Otay Ranch Village Eleven, Village Seven and Village Two to accommodate continuing growth.

- A new elementary school is being constructed in Otay Ranch Village 7 as this report is being prepared. It will be ready for occupancy in fall, 2007.
- Elementary schools are planned in each of the new Otay Ranch Villages. Current plans have identified sites in Villages 7, 11, and 2. The school in Otay Ranch Village 7 is under construction.
- The process of locating elementary schools adjacent to city parks will continue. The District is in the process of granting the City of Chula Vista an easement on its Otay School site to expand adjacent park facilities.
- Two modular classrooms were installed at Arroyo Vista in January 2006, and six modular classrooms were installed at Salt Creek in September 2006.

These efforts underscore the GMOC's emphasis that school capacity involves many interrelated factors that define an adequate physical environment. The GMOC is confident that we are moving in the right direction.

### **3.11.3 City Assistance**

The City has responded to the needs of the school districts by providing data on new growth and facilitating the planning and permit process for construction of new school facilities particularly regarding (Olympian High School which is now open), and currently Middle School 12 (The EIR for this school will be issued by the district in July 2007, positioning the district for construction on this campus in response to growth) High School 14 (grades 7-12 campus) in EUC, as well as planned elementary school facilities. The City has also worked with developers to insure that the necessary roads and utilities are in place when needed to support school construction activities.

The GMOC is pleased to see this level of interagency cooperation and how it is resulting in success. While the school districts and the city are separate

governmental entities with different sets of responsibilities, we are in the end one community with the common goal of improving the quality of life for all our residents.

The GMOC is hopeful that this positive relationship will continue and that all reasonable efforts at how we as a community can achieve our goals will be pursued.

## **3.12 OTHER TOPICS**

A new section has been added to this year's Annual Report to identify other topics that may not fit within a single prior section of the document, but warrant mentioning.

### **3.12.1 New Challenges in Western Chula Vista**

While the GMOC's focus has traditionally been on new growth in eastern Chula Vista, the GMOC in recent years has devoted increased attention to the prospects for changes in western Chula Vista, which is largely already developed. With adoption of the City's General Plan 2005, and recent adoption of the Urban Core Specific Plan, and formation of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation, for instance, the GMOC is attempting to anticipate the growth related issues and challenges associated with a greater focus on this part of the City.

### **3.12.2 Comprehensive Listing of Facility Master Plans and Related Plans**

Master plans (and/or strategic plans or other related plans) exist or are being prepared or updated for many of the topical areas addressed in growth management thresholds. These topics include:

- Wastewater (Sewer)
- Water
- Libraries
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Police
- Fire
- Schools

The status and contents of the plans are noted in the completed questionnaires and in discussions regarding several of these threshold topics. Creating a comprehensive list of relevant plans and their status can assist the GMOC in reviewing and understanding progress in meeting growth management thresholds.

### 3.12.3 Public Comments

In addition to the May 31, 2007 Community Workshop, public comments have been received during the course of the annual review process. Any formal comments received and associated responses are included in the Appendices.

## 4.0 POTENTIAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES

### 4.1 GMOC retreat & Informal Discussion Session

The GMOC convened on Saturday, April 7, 2007 to a retreat held at Nature Interpretive Center for the purpose of an informal discussion regarding existing and future thresholds that may be entertained during the next GMOC cycle.

**Discussion:** One of the GMOC's primary responsibilities under the Growth Management Program is to identify whether any threshold standard should be changed or added. Another focus is on achieving enforcement of the threshold standards through implementation measures.

The discussion focused around the present thresholds and whether they should be considered for future modification, and whether any new thresholds should be considered, e.g., Solid Waste and/or Recycling, Environmental, Housing/Homelessness, Hospitals/Health Care (that includes the provision of emergency services to the local Solid Waste and/or Recycling, Environmental, Housing/Homelessness, Hospitals/Health Care (that includes the provision of emergency services to the local community), Public Transportation and Public Facilities/Community Purpose Facilities.

The Commissioners discussed existing thresholds and recommended that for the next GMOC cycle the following should be under review: Water discharge quality, Flood control/maintenance, Sedimentation/poor drainage, Costs, Naturally occurring vegetation, Infrastructure.

GMOC may form a sub-committee before the next cycle to work with Police Department to research the levels of service and community perception/feedback (fear, inadequacy) and may also work with Fire Department as both work together as first responders.

The following summarizes the outcome of the discussion on existing thresholds that should be revisited and addressed in order for these thresholds to become a more effective tool .

#### **4.1.1 Water/Drainage – overall review of threshold, i.e.,**

- Flood control / maintenance
- Sedimentation and poor drainage (issue), costs, infrastructure should have a level and or standard for measuring (example given % of), naturally occurring vegetation (its impacts and costs to maintenance)
- Water discharge quality
- Maintenance access paths (possibly made of materials other than concrete) to reduce overall maintenance costs

#### **4.1.2 Police Department – Specifics of why they are not meeting the threshold – should it be redefined, and revisit the benchmark.**

- What is actually being achieved compared to the type 2 calls
- Are geographical locations affecting performance
- Number of officers, deployments should be part of the police report, noted change of population and area of City, type and size increase new metrics need to be introduced in the report/questionnaire,
- Areas should reviewed / broken down by service areas east and west
- Housing Stock (older vs. newer).

The GMOC proposes that a sub-committee be formed prior to the next GMOC review cycle to work with Police Department to research levels of service and community perception/ feedback (fears, in-adequacies). May also review with Fire Department as both work together as first responders. The performance on each side of I-805 needs to be reviewed in order to look at degradation of services. The performance numbers for the upcoming GMOC review cycles should be provided to the subcommittee to analyze before the actual questionnaire is submitted.

#### **4.1.3 Libraries**

- Square footage vs. facilities and services
- Should they expand their media services

It was noted that this threshold should not be judged on numbers of facilities but to the services and availability to the public, how well is the community being served, and part of the benchmark should be services offered.

#### **4.1.4 Park and Recreation**

- Hours of operation and access
- Uses – passive vs. active
- Types and numbers of programs
- Realistic requirement of parkland east and west sides of the City
- Organized programs that preclude public usage from outside of local address
- Joint use of School/Parks sites

Joint use and cooperatives with Schools/Park and Recreation should be entertained again and reviewed for inclusion into the next GMOC Annual Report.

#### **4.1.5 Traffic**

- Consider monitoring and reporting on levels of service of key regional transportation, transecting Chula Vista such I-805 and I-5 as is presently done for City arterials.
- Should the city have a Traffic Plan, (such as those being done for other cities, e.g. Santee), defining the city's strategy toward sustaining and improving traffic conditions on local and key regional roadways, such as we have with master plans for parks, fire, and police?

#### **4.1.6 Possible New Thresholds**

- Solid Waste and/or Recycling
- Environmental
- Housing/Homelessness
- Hospitals/Health Care, which includes emergency service to the local community
- Public Transportation
- Public Facilities/Community Purpose Facilities

### **4.2 2006 Planning Commission/City Council Referrals**

The following are comments (Referrals) from the joint City Council/GMOC/Planning Commission meeting held on June 15, 2006. The referrals were reviewed by the GMOC and included in the 2007 Annual Report, along with GMOC recommendations. The following is a list of the topics associated with the referrals; which are explained and addressed on the following pages.

- Air Quality
- Fiscal
- Libraries
- Drainage
- Parks & Recreation
- Traffic
- Sewer
- Schools
- Other Council Comments

The referrals are listed below with discussion/comments.

**Air Quality:**

- GMOC to review the Air Quality Threshold and consider inclusion of measurable standards with respect to pollution reduction targets or other metrics. The standard should address regional, cumulative, and local air quality conditions, and be able to effectively gauge our contributions to air pollution/air quality.

**Discussion**

GMOC staff communicated with Air Pollution Control District (APCD) staff and convened a meeting with Community Development Staff, to determine how to address metrics for CO<sub>2</sub> within the local community (specifically the western portion of the City), and to make a determination of how a program such as the Leadership Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) could be used for a possible foundation to address this issue.

A meeting was conducted with members of Planning and Community Development departments to initiate discussion on how the following programs could fall within the basic foundation of LEED in order to establish metrics for CO<sub>2</sub>.

- Green Star Program – addresses new development and incorporates appropriate materials for the building, to reduce CO<sub>2</sub>. The program provides incentives for the developer to take advantage of this program.
- Conversion of Buses/City Vehicles to Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) reduces CO<sub>2</sub> and provides metrics for the reduction CO<sub>2</sub>.

GMOC staff is of the opinion that further review should be conducted, resources identified, and further coordination with the City's Department of Conservation developed to establish the foundation for a viable program that appropriately addresses the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction metrics as well as the concept that all relevant programs have CO<sub>2</sub> targets. There is a need to assess how those might correlate to a CO<sub>2</sub> metric for the GMOC AQ thresholds. GMOC concluded that it is premature to address this at now without further review and the correlation with existing programs. For the 2008 GMOC review cycle, staff could review and evaluate through the LEED or other program how this issue could best be served.

**Fiscal:**

- Review with the Department of Finance and Office of Budget Analysis to ensure that 8% of reserve capacity during future reviews is set aside for the fiscal health of the City.

**Discussion**

The Director of Finance presented the Fiscal Overview Report on how the city was doing financially and disclosed the position of the city regarding the 8% reserve.

The city is meeting its obligation on the 8% reserve. Through cut backs in major equipment, acquisition of future equipment, and some deferred maintenance, the present fiscal year reserve is at 8.5%.

A brief history of the City Council Policy on an 8% reserve and how it was established was presented. The report also briefed the GMOC on the fiscal review of expenditures/revenues for the present fiscal year

regarding Sales and Property Taxes, Other Revenues, Expenditures, Capital Improvements, Forecast (12 –18 months and 5- 7 years) and the Long Term Financial Plan (10 Year Outlook). The Director of Finance went on to explain how the outlook for revenues was being anticipated through the above mechanisms for both forecast periods (see attached report for specifics).

In order for the City to maintain an 8% reserve the Finance Director indicated that the Finance Department is in the process of generating the Long Term Financial Plan that will include a contingency plan to address fiscal challenges that the City may face due to unanticipated swings in the economy, further State funding cuts or other unforeseen events. Once this plan is completed and approved by the City Council, it will be updated by the Finance Department each year prior to the beginning of the budget cycle. The financial plan would serve during the required annual fiscal report presented to the GMOC as part of the annual review of thresholds. The GMOC will review and comment on an annual basis on the Long Term Financial Plan.

There was also a referral that was made in 2006 as to the disposition of the unused Interim SR-125 Development Impact Fee funds and the legal issues regarding their use. The City Attorney's office analyzed the issue, and found that the City's actions complied with state law, and this opinion was provide to the GMOC. At last year's joint CC/PC/GMOC workshop, Council requested that an update report regarding use of the fee be provided.

#### **Libraries:**

- Establish some level of minimum staffing for libraries in the threshold.

#### **Discussion:**

GMOC staff met with the Assistant Director of Libraries to discuss levels of minimum staffing for libraries as well as hours of operation and access. The Assistant Director provided background on the process libraries use to determine minimum level of staffing for library facilities, and provided the following statement prepared on behalf of the Library Director:

Within the operating budget appropriated by City Council, the Library Director staffs the libraries to deliver the services called for in its multi-year strategic plan. The Library Director allocates the annual budget towards staffing to keep the full-service area libraries open and safe, provide free homework and formal learning support, continue children's programming, assist with and maintain public computers, and select and process new books and materials to enrich lives for all Chula Vista residents. Therefore, in view of the Strategic plan for the libraries an additional specific minimum staffing level for a threshold isn't practical or necessary.

In the next review cycle the GMOC will address staffing and hours of operation as part of the expanded threshold.

#### **Drainage:**

- Review the Drainage Threshold for consideration of inclusion of a water quality oriented component. This should include aspects related to sedimentation, etc., and the maintenance of drainage facilities. The GMOC should determine what methodology to recommend for measuring impacts.

### Discussion:

The Director of Public Works Operations presented a report on drainage and water quality to the GMOC. As stated in the report, the issue pertaining to water quality and the incorporation into the Threshold was not necessary because extensive regulations and programs to maintain water quality are already in place through NPDES (National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System).

To elaborate, under the storm water permit regulations, all new development and redevelopment projects are required to comply with all storm water management requirements, including the design and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and/or Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, all of which are based upon dry and wet weather water quality pollutants of concern. Specific and prescriptive requirements and BMPs are specific to site conditions and pollutants of concern therefore one solution or approach would not work.

The GMOC is studying what those standards might be and how they could be integrated into the present threshold standard.

### **Parks & Recreation:**

- The GMOC review and comment on the geographic distinction between east and west side circumstances as regards park acreage and application of the Parks threshold standard.

### Discussion:

GMOC has reviewed the implementation of citywide standard up as part of the top to bottom Growth Management review, previously directed by Council and has formulated proposed revision for the standard to apply citywide. This avoids particular east/west divides and simply indicates that all new development should proportionally contribute to the provision of park lands at the rate of 3 acres per 1000 population, consistent with the PDO standard.

The GMOC will continue to study the fees and the opportunities to create more parks and recreation facilities for the west side of the City will be brought forward in the next cycle.

### **Police:**

- Examine Police Priority I (emergency) calls with responses greater than 10 minutes.

### Discussion:

It was reported to the GMOC that during FY 05-06, 5.9% (50) of Priority Calls had response times greater than 10 minutes. The most common P1 call type with a response time over 10 minutes was robbery/duress alarm. All robbery/duress alarm calls were false alarms.

The most common reason P1 response times were over 10 minutes was that there were limited or no units available, as well as the 3-7 PM false alarms that occur between these hours, which are the 4 busiest hours for PD. Average long P1 CFS response time 13:36, 46% of long P1 CFS had response times between 10 and 11

minutes. The Police Department is conducting Beat 32 “surge” on several Friday swing shifts in order to determine how many officers are necessary to bring down response times.

The GMOC understands what these calls relate to and notes that P1 response has improved in this cycle, while P2 has not. In the next cycle the GMOC will be reviewing any actual negative outcomes or the potential for negative outcomes in P1 and P2 calls. In response to this referral the GMOC was informed that the Public Safety Commission had reviewed the report from the Police Chief and the same report was presented to the GMOC.

**Sewer:**

- City staff should work with other agencies to put together a sewage treatment facility in the South County.

Discussion:

Staff from the Engineering Department is currently participating in a Joint Feasibility Study with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority to explore constructing a wastewater reclamation plant (4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Main Street) that would take a portion of raw sewage from the sewer system, and treat and generate recycled water that would then be utilized by Otay and Sweetwater irrigation needs. (Report due to Engineering Summer of 2007).

Another avenue that is being explored is the expansion and acceleration of the planned Southbay treatment plant (at the Tijuana River) – This option involves partnering with the City of San Diego to expand and accelerate the construction of the planned 21 Mgd Southbay treatment plant. Under this scenario the City would fund the incremental cost of expanding the facility to a 26 Mgd plant. The proposed study is to be completed within four months and a report presented to in the fall of 2007.

GMOC will review all studies prior to providing any further recommendations.

**Traffic: Roadway Maintenance**

- The GMOC should look at roadway maintenance and repair along the same lines as the level of service analysis.

Discussion:

City Council at its meeting of April 5, 2007 had an opportunity to review the Infrastructure Report on road maintenance and improvements and the Pavement Management Program. These documents are under further review by the Engineering Department. GMOC will not have an opportunity to review the results and provide recommendation on the Infrastructure Report in this GMOC cycle. However, GMOC would acquire this document, when it is finalized and will review it during the next GMOC cycle.

**Schools:**

- To consider the inclusion of higher-education facilities as part of the Schools Threshold.

### Discussion:

GMOC staff met with a representative from Southwestern College to initiate and explore possibilities for the inclusion of higher-education facilities as part of the School Threshold; and plan to hold further discussions in the next review cycle.

### **Transportation and Transit Threshold:**

- To consider creating a 12<sup>th</sup> threshold standard for a “Transportation Element” which would address transit and improving mobility, rather than just measuring the level of traffic flow as occurs now under Traffic Threshold.

### Discussion:

GMOC staff met with representatives from both Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and Chula Vista Transit (CVT) to discuss bus rapid transit system and the nuances of the provision of this service, what it would entail to develop a rapid transit system for the City of Chula Vista. The following is a synopsis of the discussion, background, how services are provided to the community at large, and what it would take to formulate a system like (BRT) for the City of Chula Vista.

Those discussions focused on a number of practical considerations that would affect the ability to establish such a system and make it a viable project. A rapid transit system threshold would be difficult in light of the following facts.

- One of two major obstacles is funding and the other is rider-ship. Most funding generated for (BRT) systems is through grants, which can sometimes last up to 2 years and then they go away.
- Rider-ship stability and frequency
- Frequency of service
- Percentage improvement over a five year period (metrics)
- Lane preference treatment
- Priority treatment over other traffic
- Routes and destination
- Some of the challenges are financing, sustainability of service, providing priority to a rapid transit system to make it competitive and community acceptance of mass transit as an alternative.
- One of the recommendations made by (MTS) staff was that a full Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) for Transit and Mobility should be conducted within the City of Chula Vista.

The intricacies of this issue make it impractical for GMOC to consider as a 12<sup>th</sup> Threshold at this time.

### **Healthcare**

- To look into the adequacy of medical and health care service facilities for the community.

### Discussion:

The GMOC at its informal workshop April 7, 2007, discussed the issue of adequacy of medical and health care service facilities to the community. The intricacies of this issue make it impractical for the GMOC to address as a Threshold at this time.

## **5.0 APPENDICES**

- 5.1 Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementing Actions**
- 5.2 Appendix B – Workshop Report (Included in Volume II)**
- 5.3 Appendix C – Growth Forecast (Included in Volume II)**
- 5.4.1 Appendix D – Threshold Questionnaires and Supplemental Data (Included in Volume II)**